Federal Government in particular. Several years ago, it was estimated that an 8-cent-a-pack increase in taxes would lead to 1.8 million quitting or not starting to smoke. This would include over 400,000 teenagers, more than half a million young adults 20–25, and nearly half a million adults 26–35.

The Federal cigarette excise tax rate has not kept pace with the increase in various economic indicators over the years. It has increased only twice during the post-World War II period—from 7 cents per pack in 1950 to 8 cents in 1951 and from 8 cents to 16 cents in 1982. Federal tax as a percent of cigarette price—including tax—declined from 42.2 to 10.7 percent between 1947 and 1982 and is now at 16.6 percent, about the same level as 1975.

The price of a pack of cigarettes has increased in 1984 dollars from about 78 cents per pack in 1950 to about 96 cents per pack in 1984. Over the same period, the sum of average State and Federal excise taxes in 1984 dollars had declined from about 70 cents per pack to 30 cents per pack.

Federal receipts from the cigarette excise tax increased in absolute terms from $1.2 billion in fiscal year 1950 to $2.1 billion in fiscal year 1982. They declined as a share of total tax revenue from 3.2 to 0.4 percent, and declined as a share of GNP from 0.5 percent to less than 0.1 percent. As result of TEFRA, cigarette excise tax receipts increased to $4.7 billion in fiscal year 1984. This represents about 0.7 percent of Federal tax revenues and slightly more than 0.1 percent of GNP.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that if the cigarette excise tax is raised from $0.16 to $0.32 per pack the revenue generated would be $3.1 billion in 1987, $3.3 billion in 1988, and $3.4 billion in 1989. If the tax were raised to $0.24 per pack, the new income to the Treasury would be $1.6 billion in 1987 and $1.7 billion in 1988 and 1989.

The 100th Congress will make a major effort to improve the Medicare Program and to provide catastrophic health protection to the American people. The increased revenues from this excise tax can help pay for these new health initiatives, or it can be used, in whole or part, for deficit reduction and the avoidance of spending cuts on vital health programs.

An increase in the cigarette excise tax is a user fee. It recovers for the public some of the costs to society of smoking-related diseases and fires. The administration has proposed many user fees over the last few years. I hope that they will support this proposal as one of the most socially useful user fees we can ever consider.

HR 145

THE COMPUTER SECURITY ACT OF 1987

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 1987

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Congressman GLICKMAN and the other members of the Science and Technology Commmittee for their sponsorship of the Computer Security Act of 1987. This legislation would authorize the National Bureau of Standards [NBS] to establish a program to increase the awareness of computer security throughout the Federal Government. Under the bill, NBS would assess the vulnerability of Government computers and communications except for critical defense and intelligence systems. It would develop technical and management countermeasures to defend against illegal access to sensitive agency information and work with the private sector to apply these safeguards to their systems as well.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is urgently needed. Current estimates from the Office of Technology Assessment indicate that over $60 billion is spent annually by Federal agencies to acquire, develop and use information technology. While computer technology has greatly increased the efficiency of Government programs, it has also made agency records vulnerable to widespread alteration, manipulation, or destruction by criminal or foreign elements.

Despite this tremendous potential for abuse, most agencies have placed such a low priority on protecting their computer systems that even the most basic security measures do not exist. Over the years, the Government Operations Committee has conducted extensive investigations of computer and telecommunications facilities of several major Federal agencies. In almost every case, computer security was lax and in some cases virtually nonexistent.

In my view, the Computer Security Act will correct this problem by establishing a firm statutory base to ensure that a viable governmentwide computer security program is implemented by Federal agencies. Unfortunately, DOD and other national security agencies do not share this view. These agencies believe they should have the final say over computer security standards for the Federal Government, not the National Bureau of Standards. They point out that under National Security Decision Directive [NSDD] 145, DOD has been given this authority, including the right to restrict public access to not only classified information, but also to any civilian agency information which it considers unclassified, but sensitive.

This authority was expanded on October 29, 1986, under a directive issued by Admiral Poindexter which further restricted public access to unclassified information. Coincidentally, the admiral's directive specifically singled out unclassified information related to "foreign relations of the U.S. Government" as needing extra protection from public disclosure.

It is my strong belief that NSDD 145 is one of the most ill advised and troublesome directives ever issued by a President. It is an unprecedented expansion of the military's influence into our society which is unhealthy and potentially dangerous. Clearly, the basement of the White House and the corridors of the Pentagon are not places at which national policy should be established. This issue should be debated and fully aired in public hearings and I would hope the President would support our efforts to see this is done. In any case, I urge all Members to support the Computer Security Act as a much more sane and effective way to deal with the computer security problems facing our Government.

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ACT

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 1987

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing H.R. 5, the School Improvement Act of 1987. Congressman BILL GOODLING, as ranking Republican member of the Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Educational Subcommittee, is joining me as cosponsor of this legislation.

The bill is straight forward. It merely extends without amendment all the expiring Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Programs until 1993. I have attached at the end of this statement a list of all of the programs which expire and their current termination dates.

We hope to use this bill as a legislative vehicle to comprehensively review these expiring programs, which include all of the programs the Federal Government sponsors in elementary and secondary education except for the education of the handicapped and high school vocational education programs. We would plan to deal with these programs in a comprehensive legislative package in order to foster an orderly, coordinated approach to elementary and secondary education at the Federal level. The last time Congress comprehensively reviewed these programs was nearly 10 years ago in 1977–78. We believe that it is well past the time for us to again conduct such an overview.

As complements to H.R. 5, we expect to introduce several additional bills calling for substantive changes in the programs extended by H.R. 5. For instance, today Mr. GOODLING and I will reintroduce the Effective Schools and Even Start Act, which the House of Representatives passed last year but which was not acted upon by the Senate. We hope to incorporate the concepts of that bill into the chapter 2 program and other programs covered by H.R. 5.

We also hope to introduce in a few weeks a bill proposing amendments to chapter 1 and other amendments to chapter 2. We would encourage other Members to introduce their own bills, amending the various expiring elementary and secondary programs and proposing new approaches for improving our schools.

The Committee on Education and Labor will conduct hearings on H.R. 5 and all related legislation in February and March of this year, and then we will begin to mark up legislation in early spring. We plan to fold all of our amendments affecting these programs into H.R. 5, as it will be reported from the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the new Congress wants to improve the economic competitiveness of the United States. We believe that this bill has as much potential to achieve that task as any other piece of legislation being proposed this year. In other words, if we do not improve the educational level of our people, the enactment of every other piece of legislation will merely provide us with short-term benefits but no long-term gains to address this national emergency. We look forward to working with all of our colleagues on this proposal.

The table of expiring programs covered by H.R. 5 follows:

EXPIRING ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Following is a list of elementary and secondary education programs and their expiration dates:

Programs expiring at the end of fiscal year 1987 (September 30, 1987).

Chapter 1, Education Consolidation and Improvement Act.

Chapter 2, Education Consolidation and Improvement Act.

Programs expiring at the end of fiscal year 1988 (September 30, 1988).

Adult Education Act.

Bilingual Education Act.

Impact Aid.

Education for Economic Security Act (math and science).

Magnet Schools Assistance.

Excellence in Education (small discretionary grants for experimental programs to improve educational quality).

Programs expiring at the end of fiscal year 1989 (September 30, 1989).

Emergency Immigrant Education (for school districts impacted with immigrant and alien children).

Indian Education.

Women's Educational Equity Act (small discretionary projects to promote equity in education).

Ellender Fellowship Program (fellowships for poor students to attend the Close Up Program on the Federal government).

General Assistance for the Virgin Islands and Territorial Teacher Training (two special territorial programs).

All of these programs are subject to the automatic extension provision in the General Education Provisions Act. This provision permits forward-funded programs to be considered for two additional years, and current-funded programs to be considered extended for one additional year, even if a reauthorization bill has not been enacted. This enables the Congress to make appropriations for the upcoming year for a program that has not been reauthorized yet.

BILL TO EXTEND TERMS FOR U.S. REPRESENTATIVES

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 1987

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designed to extend the length of term for U.S. Representatives. My proposal, requiring a constitutional amendment, would allow Representatives to serve two 4-year terms and one 2-year term in every 10-year period following reapportionment. This legislation will help to ease compaign pressures somewhat and enable us to become more effective legislators.

There are many benefits to extending the term for U.S. Representatives. First, it will at least partially liberate Members from a constant preoccupation with campaigning, thereby giving us a greater opportunity to legislate effectively and to better represent our constituencies. Second, it will help moderate the spiraling cost of campaigning. In just under 700 days we will be facing another election and another effort to raise several hundred thousand dollars to win. If you spend the average amount that a Congressman must spend to be reelected, you will have to raise about $500 a day for each of those 700 days to defend your incumbency. And finally, it will reduce the number of political campaigns, providing voters with a welcome respite from campaign rhetoric.

Over 20 years ago President Lyndon Johnson suggested that it was time to take a look at the 2-year term that Members of Congress face under the Constitution. At the time, his idea floundered for several reasons. Primarily, Members of the Senate were loath to support a change in the Constitution which would give Members of the House a chance to run for the Senate without sacrificing their seats. The need to again consider change in this area is clear.

The legislation I am introducing today to extend the length of terms would provide that all House seats would be contested in years of reapportionment. After the election, the House would divide its seats, by lot, into two equal groups. Seats in the first group would be contested in two years, and thereafter every four years until the next reapportionment. Seats in the second group would be contested in 4 years, 4 years after that, and then in 2 years, until the next reapportionment. There would be no limit on the number of terms a Member could serve, although he or she would be required to resign in order to file and run for the Senate, thus removing one of the earlier obstacles in the path of this legislation. For each Member it would mean standing three times for reelection between reapportionments, rather than five times.

Some Members are hesitant to change the Constitution, but a review of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention makes it clear that the reason for 2-year terms was to guarantee that Members of Congress kept in close touch with their constituencies. The travel and communications potential available to Members today is considerably different than it was 200 years ago. Most of us can return to our districts in only a few hours and the incumbent who ignores his constituency can seldom survive.

In addition, some Members have advised me that they are afraid their constituents will view this kind of change as self-aggrandizement. I disagree with this conclusion. In scores of town meetings across my marginal, conservative district I find that my voters are sated with political campaigns. They would not miss the opportunity to see my face on television every other October. Many volunteer that frequent elections seem wasteful and unnecessary.

As we embark on the 100th Congress and the bicentennial celebration of our great Constitution, I believe we should seize the opportunity to look anew at the House of Representatives. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this timely and necessary congressional reform.

REDRESS FOR JAPANESE AMERICANS

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 6, 1987

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that NORM MINETA and I join our esteemed majority leader TOM FOLEY and a great number of our distinguished colleagues in introducing the Civil Liberties Act of 1987. This legislation addresses an issue of fundamental importance to our system of constitutional liberty.

This bill, which will be number H.R. 442, is designed to specifically implement the findings and recommendations of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilians. H.R. 442, is nearly identical in substance to the bill introduced in the 99th Congress.

The number assigned to the bill has been chosen in order to honor the famous 442d Regimental Combat Team of World War II. This entirely Japanese American military unit of the Second World War fought in some of the fiercest and bloodiest campaigns of the European Theater. It was the most highly decorated unit of its size in the military history of the United States. During 5 major campaigns, the soldiers in this unit earned over 18,000 decorations and were awarded more than 9,000 Purple Hearts. It is fitting that this historic legislation should be designated in honor of these fine men.

President Reagan has said that a true American patriot is one who cherishes our Nation's ideals and strives to narrow the gap between those ideals and reality. We have an opportunity to narrow that gap and restore our constitutional system to its proper balance. By passing H.R. 442, we can at last provide redress to those Americans of Japanese ancestry who were deprived of their basic constitutional rights during World War II.

On February 19, 1942, the President of the United States signed Executive Order 9066. It was the first step in a personal odyssey in which my citizenship and my parents' citizenship suddenly meant nothing. The exclusion and detention order recognized ancestry and only ancestry. Our loyalty to the United States was measured by whether we had one-sixteenth or more Japanese blood.

American citizens of Japanese ancestry and resident aliens were prohibited from living, working, or traveling on the west coast. We were removed to temporary assembly centers, mostly stables, race tracks, and fairgrounds. Then on to relocation camps in bleak, desolate areas where conditions ranged from tolerable to deplorable.

The first camp was opened in May 1942. My parents have told me about the barbed wire fences and sentry dogs, of loss of privacy and lack of adequate sanitation. They have related stories of the emotional distress created by the camp environment and the heartwrenching divisions that occurred as families were separated by physical distance.

No one, not even our keepers, knew when we would be free to return to our homes. The indeterminate sentence for a crime we did not commit became a quiet form of torture. We were rendered helpless in our own homeland.

The rationale of these actions was national security. But the order was promulgated regardless of the fact that no documented cases of disloyalty by Japanese Americans existed and none have subsequently arisen.

My parents were proud citizens of the United States—a country they had known to be just and ruled by a reasoned constitutional law. But the exclusion order resulted in the circumvention of basic procedural rights. Seven of the ten provisions of the Bill of Rights were ignored. There was no review or